

FORCES SET UP IN A CONDUCTOR
BY A
CURRENT "PINCH EFFECT"

G. M. VALERIO

ARMOUR INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

1909

537.22
U 23



**Illinois Institute
of Technology
Libraries**

AT 165
Valerio, Giuseppe Mastro
Forces set up in a conductor
by a current pinch effect

FORCES SET UP IN A
CONDUCTOR BY A CURRENT
“ PINCH EFFECT ”

A THESIS

PRESENTED BY

GIUSEPPE MASTRO-VALERIO

TO THE

PRESIDENT AND FACULTY

OF

ARMOUR INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

FOR THE DEGREE OF

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

HAVING COMPLETED THE PRESCRIBED COURSE OF STUDY IN

ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

Handwritten signature and date
1917

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
PAUL V. GALVIN LIBRARY
35 WEST 33RD STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60616

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. - Object of Thesis and Introduction.
- II. - "Dinic Effect".
- III. - Mathematical Derivation of the "Dinic Effect".
- IV. - Experiments described in the manuscript.
 - a. - Theory Intercepted.
 - b. - Experiment showing that a given current gives a given constant pressure.
 - c. - Apparatus by which pressure at the center was measured.
- V. - Can we measure the difference in pressure at different places in the conductor?
- VI. - Experiment performed.
- VII. - Reasons why a given experiment would not work.
- VIII. - Conclusion.

1.

The object of this thesis was:- "To find the relation between the distance from the center of a conductor has on the so called "pinch effect" and the current in it". This however, I was unable to find out exactly fully. In spite of the very valuable help which I received from Mr. Wilcox (and I wish to say very much for that), still I could not get the apparatus which at least could show that the pinch effect is different at different parts of the conductor, even if I could not measure such differences. I had only the opportunity of an experiment which was suggested by Mr. Bidder, but this did not lead to any results. There was very little or no relation between which the current flows and the width of the subject. In fact, the only relation is an article published in the "Physical Review" of Nov. 1907 - volume 24, and written by Mr. Edwin W. Washburn. This however, is an entirely un-critical article, and although it describes experiments which prove that the pinch effect is different at different parts, still it does not give any idea as to how to go on to prove the relation of the pinch effect to the distance from the center of the conductor. Further I go any further, however, I think it best to say that the so-called "pinch effect".

11

If A and B (Fig. -I) are two conductors such that the current in the direction indicated by the arrows, fields will be set up

$$I_r = \frac{2Ir}{R^2}$$

$$\frac{I}{A} = \frac{di}{da}$$

$$da = \pi(r + dr)^2 - \pi r^2 = 2\pi r dr$$

$$dR = \frac{dr}{R^2}$$

$$\text{As } \pi R^2 = \dots$$

$$di = \frac{2I r dr}{R^2}$$

Therefore, the force on the shell is the sum of the forces on all the elements. Since the shell is thin, we can assume that the force on each element is the same as the force on a small area element of the shell. The force on a small area element of the shell is given by $dF = \rho di r$, where ρ is the density of the shell, di is the area element, and r is the radius of the shell. The total force on the shell is then given by $F = \int dF = \int \rho di r$.

$$dF = \rho di r$$

$$dF = \frac{dF}{2\pi r \rho} = \frac{2I^2 r dr}{\pi R^4}$$

The force on the shell is the sum of the forces on all the elements, which is $F = \int dF = \int \frac{2I^2 r dr}{\pi R^4}$.

$$F = \frac{2I^2}{\pi R^4} \int_r^R r dr = \frac{I^2}{\pi R^4} (R^2 - r^2)$$

If we let I^2 equals constant, then $F = \frac{I^2}{\pi R^4} (R^2 - r^2)$.

$$I^2 = \pi I'^2 R^4$$

Substituting

$$F = \pi I'^2 (R^2 - r^2)$$

Therefore,

$$F = \pi I'^2 R^2$$

which is the force on the shell of radius R and thickness dr .

If we let F be

equals to

which is the force on the shell of radius R and thickness dr .

Example 1.1

$$g = \pi I^2 (R^2 + \frac{1}{4} R^2) = \frac{3}{4} \pi I^2 R^2$$

Example 1.2

Let us consider a cylindrical shell of radius r and thickness dr . The force acting on it is

$$P = 2g \ell r = 2\pi \ell r I^2 (R^2 + r^2)$$

If we consider a cylindrical shell of radius r and thickness dr

the force acting on it is

$$F = 2i i_r \frac{\ell}{r}$$

Let us consider a cylindrical shell of radius r and thickness dr

the force acting on it is

Let us consider

$$i = \frac{r^2}{R^2} I$$

Let us consider a cylindrical shell of radius r and thickness dr

$$di = \frac{2r dr I}{R^2}$$

Let us consider a cylindrical shell of radius r and thickness dr

Let us consider

$$dF = \frac{2i di \ell}{r} = \frac{4\pi I^2 r^2 dr}{R^4}$$

Let us consider

$$dg = \frac{dF}{2\pi r \ell} = \frac{2I^2 r dr}{\pi R^4}$$

Let us consider

$$g = \frac{2I^2}{\pi R^4} \int_r^R r dr = \frac{I^2 (R^2 - r^2)}{\pi R^4}$$

$$P = 2\pi I^2 r \frac{(R^2 - r^2)}{R^4}$$

Let us consider a cylindrical shell of radius r and thickness dr

... ..

$$F = \frac{2 \mu I P}{r}$$

... ..

$$F = \frac{2 \mu I^2}{r}$$

... ..

$$I' = \frac{r^2}{R^2} I$$

... ..

$$F = \frac{2 r I^2}{R^2}$$

... ..

$$F_T = 2 \pi I r$$

... ..

IV

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

IV-

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

the depression would take place in the circuit of the liquid
would be as follows.

IV-b

Another experiment was done with a device, and an apparatus as seen in
Fig. 5 was used. This consisted of a glass box, made of two glass
plates, connected by a dark channel. On the side of the box were two
cylinders as to be able to see from the outside of the level of the liquid; the tubes were
fastened at each end of the box. A liquid alloy of potassium chloride was used
in this box to a depth of two inches, the remainder of the space was filled with
kerosene. When a current of about 150 amp. was passed a depression of 1/16"
was noticed. In this experiment it was found that a given current gave a given
constant depression.

IV-c

By means of the apparatus in Fig. 6 not only was it possible to prove
the fact that the liquid effect existed but they actually measured the depression
at the center of the conductor.

As it can be seen from Fig. 6 the apparatus consists of two tubes
made of non-conducting material, the electrodes being attached to the inside
tube and the two tubes being interconnected by the holes A. It is a thin but
thick so to further reduce the cross section of the lower tube. In the
center there is a hole B. When no current was passed the level of the mercury was at a
certain level, but when a current was passed the mercury rose in the hole B,
so that with 150 amp. a rapid stream was obtained. When a tube was fitted in
it was found that the mercury rose 1/16 of an inch.

In order to increase this effect they fitted in place of the disk
made of iron and silver as seen in Fig. 6. This disk consists of a piece of
fiber like B and a piece of iron, the iron being about 1/16 of an inch and the
whole thing was fitted in the hole at the bottom of the slot between
one of the holes A. (Fig. 7) Now the effect of the current is still the same.

space of the narrow slot should be filled with a material of iron; thus, the time the material must fill the slot is almost independent of the pressure at the axis. If this slot is filled with a material with a viscosity slightly higher than that of the liquid.

The only difficulty is that the diameter of the capillary is in series as shown in the Fig. 3. If the capillary is in the middle of cap. A is filled with a material of cap. B, and so on, at least, and the same procedure is applied to the end of cap. B, etc. Now a very small amount will cause a considerable rise of the liquid. As a result, however, instead of making a road, the rise is very heavy, rises in the glass tube is small, the liquid is more, just as the oil or gelatin water, which is much lighter and therefore it takes less pressure to push it up.

V.

Now, the gas law arises. Is it possible to measure the volume of the vessel to the distance from the center of the surface? If it is easy to calculate, but can we actually measure it experimentally? At first I thought of the surface shown in Fig. 4, and it is a case of the liquid surface which is curved to a great extent. The liquid rises to the surface of the glass tubes. I tried to find that the liquid would rise according to the law of capillarity, but the pressure is the highest at the center of the surface, and the liquid at the center will rise to a higher level. In fact, I realized that it is not possible, because of the fact that the surface is not a flat surface at all points (according to the well known law of capillarity, and if the liquid rose at all, it would rise equally at all points. In fact, I have just finished this plan.

Then Mr. Teddie suggested that I take a cross section of a cylindrical conductor, and drill holes axially through it. Fill these holes with a liquid, and in passing the current through the conductor, observe by a microscope at different heights, if the holes were drilled so that they did not pass through the center. I thought this apparatus would not work for several reasons, but nevertheless did build it.

VI

I took (Fig. 10) a conductor whose diameter was .025 inches, and in it I drove four or five axial holes all at different distances from the center of the conductor. Then I drove other holes radially to the conductor and connected the axial holes to the outside surface of the conductor. Now I closedly fitted a piece of glass to the top of the axial holes, and to the radial holes I fitted a glass tube bent at right angle. In this manner I built a U tube manometer of which was the axial hole in the conductor. First I put mercury in these tubes and passed a current. I was not able to notice any rise with a current of 2000 amp. being there. Then I thought that there was an air bubble somewhere, for such an experiment, so I tried the same experiment with the same current, first with salt water and then with a solution of copper sulphate, and still no results.

VII

As I said before, there are several reasons why it is so that it would not work. First of all it is out of the question if the liquid in the conductor itself would cause the liquid to rise, because if there is some rise as a pinch effect, it is not difficult to make a ball of conductor axially, but it is taken in surplus in the form of itself, so that the cross section of the tube will not change. But just for the sake of argument let us suppose for a moment that the liquid is actually pinched. I tried this experiment first with both sides of the U tube open to the atmosphere. Then I connected the sides of the U tube so that there is no pinch effect while the liquid is at the same level in both arms of the

only pressure in there is the atmospheric pressure (14.7 l. p. sq. in.) and in the same in the two branches. Therefore its surface is 2 sq. in. of current; the pinch effect pushes the liquid toward the center. So a vacuum must be created in the tube in order to allow the liquid to rise, but if this vacuum is created by the atmospheric pressure, will it not be cancelled into play and keep the liquid at the same level, because the atmospheric pressure is as strong as the atmospheric pressure. Now I closed the switch, changed the current and I passed a current. Now again the liquid will be pushed toward the open branch and again the tendency to create vacuum, which is cancelled out, will be no rise of the liquid due to the atmospheric pressure. And this is because that the pinch effect in the iron itself will not cause the liquid to rise.

The next thing to do is to think that the pinch effect in the liquid itself might cause it to rise, this however leads into other difficulties. Of course I know that I had about 200 amp. going through the piece of iron, but how was the current distributed in that mass of iron? I know theoretically how the field was distributed and hence the pinch effect, but what part of the current for instance passed at half the distance between the center and the outside surface of the iron. And what is more to the point, does as much current pass through the liquid as passes through the iron immediately surrounding the liquid? We can see at once that, that current passing through the liquid is much less than that passing through the iron. Because the conductivity of the iron is much higher. But then if the conductivity of the iron is higher its impedance (A.C. I wish to be used) is also higher while that of the liquid is practically zero, but even so, still the current passing through the liquid is much less than 200 amp. According to Dr. Nordberg's article the pinch effect is noticeable only at high currents so the reason why we were unable to get results in this experiment was that the current was not high

the liquid. Then Mr. Wilcox suggested that I build the apparatus shown in Fig. 3 in the block of iron, as shown in Fig. 11, at different distances from the center of the conductor. Have the mercury up to a certain height in the tube A and then pass a current. Of course it is certain that the mercury would rise in this case, if the current is high enough, but then we would be getting away from our original proposition viz: "To find the relation of the pinch effect to the distance from the center of a conductor. In this case we would be proving that the pinch effect is different with different currents, because we would not be measuring the pinch effect in the conductor itself, but the pinch effect in a column of mercury put at certain distance from the center of the conductor. In which case we might just as well build an apparatus as we have in Fig. 3 and just pass different currents through it without building it in a mass of iron as was suggested.

VIII

I am sorry I am unable to show better results than I have actually obtained in this work, I must point out however that I did the best I could if we consider that although I have had plenty of good, hard experimental work in the school still I had never before done research work. To make things still worse, very little or no work has been done on this line before and in reference there are no references to be found, which might give at least some suggestions of how to go at this work. Before I close however I must again thank Mr. Wilcox for his most valuable help which he offered.

FINIS.

11
J. H.
1911

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

CHICAGO, ILL.



